

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

§  
WENDY TIPPITT, individually and as §  
the administrator of the Estate of §  
Timothy Michael Randall, §  
§  
Plaintiff, §  
§ Case No. 6:23-cv-515-JDK  
v. §  
§  
SERGEANT SHANE IVERSON, et al., §  
§  
Defendants. §  
§

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Wendy Tippitt, individually and as administrator of the estate of Timothy Michael Randall, filed this civil action against Defendants Shane Iverson, Unknown Officer, and Rusk County. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

Before the Court is Defendant Shane Iverson's motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. Docket No. 11. On February 2, 2024, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that the Court grant Iverson's motion with respect to Plaintiff's claims for false detention but deny Iverson's motion with respect to Plaintiff's federal law claims for unlawful arrest and excessive force and Plaintiff's state law claims for assault, battery, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. Docket No. 15. No objections to the report have been filed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report (Docket No. 15) is **ADOPTED**. Defendant Shane Iverson's motion to dismiss (Docket No. 11) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's claims for unlawful detention and **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's federal law claims for unlawful arrest and excessive force, and Plaintiff's state law claims for assault, battery, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 27th day of February, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE